

1 Neel Chatterjee (SBN 173985)
2 *nchatterjee@goodwinlaw.com*
3 James Lin (SBN 310440)
4 *jlin@goodwinlaw.com*
5 **GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**
6 135 Commonwealth Drive
7 Menlo Park, California 94025
8 Tel.: +1 650 752 3100
9 Fax.: +1 650 853 1038

10 Brett Schuman (SBN 189247)
11 *bschuman@goodwinlaw.com*
12 Shane Brun (SBN 179079)
13 *sbrun@goodwinlaw.com*
14 Rachel M. Walsh (SBN 250568)
15 *rwalsh@goodwinlaw.com*
16 Hayes P. Hyde (SBN 308031)
17 *hhyde@goodwinlaw.com*
18 **GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**
19 Three Embarcadero Center
20 San Francisco, California 94111
21 Tel.: +1 415 733 6000
22 Fax.: +1 415 677 9041

23 Hong-An Vu (SBN 266268)
24 *hvu@goodwinlaw.com*
25 **GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**
26 601 S. Figueroa Street, 41st Floor
27 Los Angeles, California 90017
28 Tel.: +1 213 426 2500
Fax.: +1 213 623 1673

17 *Attorneys for Defendant: Otto Trucking LLC*

18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
19 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
20 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

21 WAYMO LLC,
22 Plaintiff,
23 v.
24 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;
25 OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING
26 LLC,
27 Defendants.

28 Case No. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

DEFENDANT OTTO TRUCKING LLC'S
RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF WAYMO
LLC'S CORRECTED SUPPLEMENTAL
BRIEF (DKT NO. 1501) IN SUPPORT OF
ITS MOTION FOR ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE WHY DEFENDANTS SHOULD
NOT BE HELD IN CONTEMPT

Courtroom: 8 (19th Floor)
Judge: The Honorable William Alsup
Trial: October 10, 2017

27 [Unredacted Version of Document Sought to
28 be Sealed]

1 Defendant Otto Trucking LLC (“Otto Trucking”) hereby responds to Plaintiff Waymo
 2 LLC’s (“Waymo”) Corrected Supplemental Brief in Support of its Motion for Order to Show
 3 Cause Why Defendants Should Not Be Held in Contempt of the Preliminary Injunction Order
 4 (Dkt. 426) and Expedited Discovery Order (Dkt. 61) and proposed Jury Instruction, pursuant to
 5 the Court’s Order dated September 11, 2017 (Dkt. 1515). Otto Trucking also responds to the
 6 Court’s Order Requiring Declarations dated September 13, 2017 (Dkt. 1536).

7 Waymo has provided no basis for an adverse inference against Otto Trucking despite
 8 trying several theories. This is Waymo’s third attempt to rehash issues already presented to the
 9 Court and rejected for the same reasons the Court has rejected Waymo’s arguments before. In its
 10 first attempt, Waymo argued that the defendants had failed to take all necessary steps for the
 11 return of downloaded materials. In its second attempt, Waymo argued that Otto Trucking had
 12 failed to provide information required under the preliminary injunction order. Otto Trucking
 13 supplemented its responses under the preliminary injunction order. In their third try, Waymo
 14 relies on unspecified discovery violations to support its request for an adverse inference against
 15 Otto Trucking.

16 None of these theories support Waymo’s request for an adverse inference. *See In re*
 17 *Oracle Corp. Secur. Litig.*, 627 F.3d 376, 386-87 (9th Cir. 2010) (“A district court’s adverse
 18 inference sanction should be carefully fashioned to deny the wrongdoer the fruits of its misconduct
 19 yet not interfere with that party’s right to produce other relevant evidence.”) (citation omitted);
 20 *Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd.*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 976, 955 (N.D. Cal. 2012) (denying
 21 request for adverse inference instruction where conduct did not significantly hamper the ability to
 22 go to trial). Even if Waymo had shown that any conduct by Otto Trucking warranted an adverse
 23 inference, the jury instruction it now presents is not consistent with its theories.

24 The new facts that have come to light are Waymo’s discovery misconduct, which are
 25 reason enough to deny its request for an adverse inference and a jury instruction. From the
 26 beginning, the centerpiece of Waymo’s trade secret allegations has been Anthony Levandowski’s
 27 alleged improper downloading of 14,000 files from Waymo’s SVN server. *See* Complaint, at ¶¶ 4,
 28 44. Waymo has repeated this allegation in the majority of its papers and representations before the

1 Court, and it has called them the “crown jewels of the kind of technology that we are talking about
 2 [autonomous driving].” Declaration of Hong-An Vu (“Vu Decl.”), Ex. 1, 8/16/17 Hr’g at 71:1-12.
 3 The record now, however, shows that this was a lie. Waymo engaged in a pattern of coverups and
 4 stonewalling to prop up the central allegation in its case. Waymo tried to hide the fact that it knew
 5 its own allegations were wrong. Because of its conduct, at the very least, no instruction is
 6 appropriate as to defendants in view of Waymo’s conduct. *See* Ex. 31, 6/29/2017 Hearing Tr. at
 7 87:7-16 (“Well, I want Mr. Verhoeven to know he will be in big trouble. And if – even if I were
 8 to allow you to put on some kind of stonewalling testimony, if you stonewalled, at least they’re
 9 going to get to reply with that kind of stonewalling evidence before the jury. And the – poof! – up
 10 going all of your theory. . . . You can’t have it both ways. This is America. You don’t get it both
 11 ways.”).

12 **I. OTTO TRUCKING HAS COMPLIED WITH THE COURT’S ORDERS.**

13 To the extent that Waymo still contends that Otto Trucking has failed to comply
 14 Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Court’s Preliminary Injunction Order (Dkt. 426), Otto Trucking
 15 incorporates by reference in its entirety Defendant Otto Trucking’s Opposition to Plaintiff’s List
 16 of Defendants’ Alleged Discovery Misconduct (Dkt. 1370), filed on August 25, 2017. Otto
 17 Trucking has complied with the Court’s preliminary injunction order and has provided additional
 18 information in response to issues and questions raised by Waymo.

19 Waymo appears to be contending that the production of Seval Oz’ earrings somehow
 20 amounts to discovery misconduct. Otto Trucking responded to Waymo’s accusations that it has
 21 “improperly and selectively” using Mr. Levandowski’s assertion of the Fifth Amendment and the
 22 common interest privilege in its Opposition to Plaintiff’s List of Defendants’ Alleged Discovery
 23 Misconduct (Dkt. 1370), and in its Opposition to Plaintiff Waymo LLC’s Motion *In Limine* No.
 24 16 regarding the testimony of Ms. Seval Oz and earrings made from printed circuit boards used in
 25 LiDAR systems (Dkt. 1556-10). Otto Trucking incorporates its opposition by reference.

26 At the heart of Waymo’s assertion is that Mr. Levandowski produced text messages where
 27 he asks Ms. Oz’ about her earrings and alleges that Mr. Levandowski provided the earrings to aid
 28

1 in the defense of Otto Trucking and Uber. The problem with Waymo's allegation is that it
 2 identifies no misconduct. As Waymo knows, Mr. Levandowski has produced documents pursuant
 3 to subpoena, including in response to a request regarding Ms. Oz's earrings. In other
 4 circumstances, he has asserted his Fifth Amendment privileges. There is absolutely nothing
 5 wrong with Mr. Levandowski asserting his Fifth Amendment rights on a question by question
 6 basis. In fact, the law requires that he do so.

7 The law is clear that a witness may "pick the point beyond which he will not go" and
 8 refuse to answer questions about matters already discussed. *See Shendal v. U.S.*, 312 F.2d 564,
 9 566 (9th Cir. 1963); *In re Master Key Litig.*, 507 F.2d 292, 293-94 (9th Cir. 1974) ("The proper
 10 inquiry in this case . . . is not whether [the witness] waived his privilege simply by giving
 11 incriminating testimony as to certain company practices, but whether, in light of his prior
 12 disclosures, the testimony sought could possibly incriminate him further."). Waymo had the
 13 opportunity to ask Mr. Levandowski about public disclosures and disclosures to third-parties of
 14 Waymo's alleged trade secrets, but it chose not to do so, either through a subpoena or at a
 15 deposition. Waymo cannot now use any purported involvement by Mr. Levandowski as a basis
 16 for excluding this evidence.

17 **II. WAYMO'S CENTRAL ALLEGATION OF DOWNLOADING FILES RESTS ON
 18 ITS DISCOVERY MISCONDUCT.**

19 **A. Waymo Investigates Mr. Levandowski's Activities and Finds No Misconduct.**

20 Google began investigating Anthony Levandowski immediately after his departure from
 21 Google, with his boss, Chris Urmson, ordering an investigation by Human Resources into any
 22 possible misconduct by Mr. Levandowski, including into whether "he would have looked at files
 23 or downloaded things that were inappropriate for him to download." Vu Decl., at Ex. 22. Google
 24 initiated the investigation on February 3, 2016, which included investigating whether Google's
 25 trade secrets had been compromised. *See id.* at Ex. 10; Ex. 11 at 86805.

26 Google's forensic team, Gary Brown and Kristin Gudjonsson, imaged two laptops used by
 27 Mr. Levandowski at the time of his departure and analyzed them. *See id.* at Ex. 22, Gudjonsson
 28 Vol. I 198:22-199:9. A third desktop was not preserved and Google has not offered an

1 explanation for its spoliation. *See id.* Mr. Brown and Mr. Gudjonsson also reviewed certain log
2 information regarding Mr. Levandowski’s activities on the Google network. *See id.* at 172:4-
3 178:10. Mr. Brown, who conducted the analysis, testified that he did not find any evidence
4 misappropriation of trade secrets. *See id.* at Ex. 26, Brown PI Tr. 31:17-24; *see also* Ex. 11.
5 Consistent with Mr. Brown’s testimony, Mr. Urmson also testified that while the investigation
6 identified documents Mr. Levandowski had accessed, “None of them seemed out of the ordinary.”
7 *Id.* at Ex. 21, Urmson Tr. 182:12-16. (emphasis added).

B. After Learning about Uber’s Acquisition of Ottomotto, Waymo Accelerates the Investigation with the Help of Keker Van Nest & Peters.

10 In late July 2016, after a number of employees departed Google for Mr. Levandowski's
11 new company, Ottomotto LLC, Google renewed its investigation. *Id.* at Ex. 9. On or about
12 August 4, 2016, Keker Van Nest & Peters LLP ("Keker") began running the investigation to
13 determine whether any of the employees who left Google to join Otto [REDACTED]
14 [REDACTED] *Id.* Ex. 12 at 86812
15 (Chauffeur Forensic Investigation Memorandum).

16 Waymo accelerated the investigation after Uber announced on August 18, 2016 that it was
17 going to acquire Ottomotto. *See id.* at Ex. 13, Ex. 14. Uber was “[REDACTED]
18 [REDACTED],” and Mr. Urmson had previously written to Larry Page and Sergey
19 Brin, the founders of Google, that [REDACTED]
20 [REDACTED] *Id.*; *see also id.* at Ex. 15.

C. Waymo's SVN Administrator Informs Litigation Counsel that Mr. Levandowski's SVN Conduct is Not Suspicious.

23 On September 19, 2016, Tom Gorman, an attorney at Keker, contacted Sasha Zbrozek, the
24 engineer who set up the SVN server to inquire about downloads from the SVN server.¹ Mr.
25 Gorman also contacted Nick Vines, an engineer on Chauffeur, to inquire about downloading
26 activity on Google's Enterprise Product Data Management ("EPDM") service. *Id.* at Ex. 2. Both

¹ At this point, it is unknown how Mr. Gorman learned of the downloads.

1 responded that large downloads of data off of these repositories was normal practice and nothing
 2 out of the ordinary. *Id.*

3 On October 5, 2016, Mr. Gorman received a log of Mr. Levandowski's activities on the
 4 SVN. *Id.* After analyzing it, he concluded that Mr. Levandowski accessed the SVN server on
 5 December 11, 2015 and downloaded a large amount of data from the server, which he believed
 6 was anomalous and suspicious. *See id.* Mr. Zbrozek repeatedly rejected Mr. Gorman's
 7 interpretation, and indeed, as far back as March of 2015, when setting up the database, Mr.
 8 Zbrozek characterized the SVN data as "low value." *Id.* at Ex. 30. For example:

- 9 • Mr. Gorman asked Mr. Zbrozek, "[Mr. Levandowski] only accessed the SVN the one
 10 time on 12/11/2015? That's a little strange isn't it?" Mr. Zbrozek responded, "It's not
 11 particularly surprising that he might check things out once . . . It clearly wasn't part of
 12 his routine. **Doesn't ring alarm bells for me.**" *Id.* (emphasis added).
- 13 • Mr. Gorman asked whether the one access that Google had on record was "truly out of
 14 character" or "whether we only have a short window of logs (and therefor no idea what
 15 his normal work pattern was.)" *Id.* at Ex. 2. Mr. Zbrozek responded that the logs only
 16 dated back to September or October 2015—representing just **four months** of activity
 17 relating to Mr. Levandowski. *See id.* (emphasis added).
- 18 • Mr. Gorman also asked what materials were contained on the SVN server, to which
 19 Mr. Zbrozek responded, "It's all electronics designs – schematics and PCB layouts, and
 20 the component library for their creation. It was considered **low-value** enough that we
 21 even considered hosting it **off of Google infrastructure**" and indeed was hosted off
 22 Google security infrastructures. *See id.* at Ex. 2 (emphasis added); *see also* Ex. 24,
 23 Janosko 8/25/17 Tr. 19:3-10 (none of the [REDACTED] members of Google's security team are
 24 responsible for the SVN server); 27:1-10).
- 25 • Mr. Gorman then asked, "If these schematics are considered low-value, then where is
 26 the high-value stuff stored? Sensor designs, etc." Mr. Zbrozek responded that
 27 historically, "high-value has been algorithms and software. The hardware (at all levels)
 28 was a second class citizen." *Id.* at Ex. 2.

1 Based on his discussions with Mr. Zbrozek, Mr. Gorman acknowledged on October 5,
 2 2016 that the materials allegedly downloaded by Mr. Levandowski and that are the basis of
 3 Waymo's claims in this case, “aren't the crown jewels.” *Id.* at Ex. 3 at 86898.

4 **D. Litigation Counsel Influences the Investigation to Find Misconduct by Mr.**
 5 **Levandowski.**

6 Mr. Gorman ignored Mr. Vines and Mr. Zbrozek's comments. He emailed the
 7 investigators, Gary Brown, Kristinn Gudjonsson, and others telling them that Mr. Levandowski
 8 syncing his computer to the SVN server to download the entire repository a week before
 9 reformatting his computer was “fishy.” *Id.* Mr. Brown and Mr. Gudjonsson had no personal
 10 knowledge of the SVN server. Mr. Gorman repeated this theory again in the same
 11 communication, this time adding that he found it unusual that Mr. Levandowski would reformat to
 12 install a Linux operating system when he had another laptop running Linux. *See id.* “That's
 13 pretty suspicious, right?”, he concluded. *Id.*

14 When asked for the source supporting his conclusions, Mr. Gorman provided Mr. Brown
 15 the SVN log created by Mr. Zbrozek. *Id.* Mr. Brown testified that he then worked to “confirm”
 16 Mr. Gorman's conclusions, but he admittedly disregarded information that was “not explicitly
 17 relevant for what [they] were **trying to prove**” such as the limited data preserved related to Mr.
 18 Levandowski's SVN activities. *Id.* at Ex. 26 Brown PI Tr. at 36:9-24; Ex. 27 Brown 30(b)(6) Tr.
 19 229:3-231:8 (emphasis added). Similarly, Mr. Gudjonsson accepted Mr. Gorman's accusation that
 20 Mr. Levandowski “hadn't visited the SVN site before, and this [the December 11 activity] was the
 21 first sync as you [Tom Gorman] suggested from looking at the SVN log.” *Id.* at Ex. 3. To reach
 22 this conclusion, Mr. Gudjonsson did not take into account the limited data available for SVN
 23 activity, and either did not investigate or ignored that Mr. Levandowski had been given two SVN
 24 passwords by Mr. Zbrozek in March 2015. *See id.*; *see also id.* at Ex. 25, Zbrozek 9/6/17 Tr.
 25 287:23-289:18. This was not the first time Mr. Gudjonsson had simply accepted an allegation of
 26 wrongdoing by Mr. Levandowski that later turned out to be wrong. *See id.* at Ex. 23, Gudjonsson
 27 Tr. 9/8/17, at 460:4-19; *see also id.* at Ex. 18 at 84575.

1 As the investigation progressed, Mr. Brown and Waymo's counsel knew of discrepancies
 2 and inconsistencies in the log data resulting from their internal searches. Mr. Brown stated that
 3 "flakiness and errors in this kind of log diving is very common . . . I always operate under the
 4 assumption that if I had results, they were authoritative, but clearly that's not the case." *Id.* at Ex.

5 17. Google investigators also failed to review log information from Mr. Levandowski's G Laptop
 6 or his work station computer, or to log information relating to prior downloading activity by Mr.
 7 Levandowski that may have provided exculpating theories for Mr. Levandowski's December 11,
 8 2015 alleged downloading. *See also id.* at Ex. 22, Gudjonsson Vol. I 198:22-199:5; *id.* at Ex. 27,
 9 Brown 30(b)(6) Tr. 58:3-16; 247:19-4; 98:3-101:19. The analysis of log data used by Mr. Brown
 10 and Mr. Gudjonsson is also less than reliable by Mr. Brown's own admission. *See* Ex. 17.

11 **E. Waymo Hides The Identities of Key Witnesses from Discovery.**

12 On February 22, 2017, counsel for Google emailed Mr. Zbrozek asking for information
 13 regarding the number and size of the files Mr. Levandowski allegedly downloaded to be used as
 14 part of the Complaint. *Id.* at Ex. 4 at 86940. In response, in an email copying attorneys from
 15 Quinn Emanuel, Mr. Zbrozek expressed his concerns regarding Waymo's theories:

16 "I'm a little leery because both of those numbers aren't really meaningful in
 17 any narrative. It also has a chilling effect on being a hardware engineer – we
 18 do full checkouts and it makes me uncomfortable to think that lawyers are
 trying to ascribe suspicion to it."

19 *Id.* That same day, he sent counsel the SVN instructions that direct a user to download the entire
 20 repository. *Id.* Mr. Zbrozek's concerns went unheeded by Waymo and its counsel.

21 Waymo filed its complaint the following day alleging that Defendants misappropriated its
 22 trade secrets based on Mr. Levandowski's alleged downloading of 14,000 files from the SVN
 23 server, the very documents that Mr. Zbrozek had said were "low-value" and that Mr. Gorman had
 24 concluded were "not the crown jewels." *See* Dkt. 1. Waymo presented a tale of suspicious
 25 activity in downloading such a large volume, when Mr. Zbrozek had made clear that this kind of
 26 downloading was simply the way the SVN system worked. *See* Vu Decl., Ex. 2, 4. At his
 27 deposition after the February 22 communication was produced, Mr. Zbrozek confirmed his
 28

1 concerns that “one action in isolation being in and of itself a marker of suspicion” and that the
 2 attorneys he was working with were “not that interested in [his] opinions; they were just interested
 3 in information.” *Id.* at Ex. 25, Zbrozek 9/6 Tr. 239:17-25; 261:3-18.

4 In moving for a preliminary injunction, Waymo did not submit a declaration from Mr.
 5 Zbrozek. Instead, Waymo submitted declarations from Gary Brown and Michael Janosko—both
 6 of whom lacked knowledge of how the SVN and its security systems worked. *Id.* at Ex. 27,
 7 Brown 30(b)(6) Tr. at 48:9-49:19; Ex. 24, Janosko 8/25/17 Tr. 60:19-23. In his first deposition,
 8 Mr. Brown demonstrated that he had little knowledge of the SVN server’s contents and was
 9 instead provided logs by Mr. Gorman to analyze and to corroborate Mr. Gorman’s conclusions.
 10 *Id.* at Ex. 27, Brown 30(b)(6) Tr. at 48:9-49:19; 229:3-231:8; Ex. 26, Brown PI Tr. at 36:9-24.

11 Mr. Janosko’s declaration describes the advanced Google security infrastructure in an
 12 effort to convince the Court that Waymo had protected its trade secrets, when in fact, the SVN
 13 server is outside Google’s security network. *See* Vu Decl., Ex. 19, Janosko Dec. at ¶ 25;

14 Q. Sure. So your declaration here has several pages where you talk about this
 15 multilayered Google infrastructure, but then you also say that Subversion is
 16 not on this network?
 17 A. Correct.

18 Q. Are you aware of at any point Subversion being on the Google network
 19 such that it would be protected in the - by the tools that are described in the
 20 first - pages 2 to 5 of your declaration?
 21 A. I am not aware of any time when it was internal.

22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005
 1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 10010
 10011
 10012
 10013
 10014
 10015
 10016
 10017
 10018
 10019
 10020
 10021
 10022
 10023
 10024
 10025
 10026
 10027
 10028
 10029
 10030
 10031
 10032
 10033
 10034
 10035
 10036
 10037
 10038
 10039
 10040
 10041
 10042
 10043
 10044
 10045
 10046
 10047
 10048
 10049
 10050
 10051
 10052
 10053
 10054
 10055
 10056
 10057
 10058
 10059
 10060
 10061
 10062
 10063
 10064
 10065
 10066
 10067
 10068
 10069
 10070
 10071
 10072
 10073
 10074
 10075
 10076
 10077
 10078
 10079
 10080
 10081
 10082
 10083
 10084
 10085
 10086
 10087
 10088
 10089
 10090
 10091
 10092
 10093
 10094
 10095
 10096
 10097
 10098
 10099
 100100
 100101
 100102
 100103
 100104
 100105
 100106
 100107
 100108
 100109
 100110
 100111
 100112
 100113
 100114
 100115
 100116
 100117
 100118
 100119
 100120
 100121
 100122
 100123
 100124
 100125
 100126
 100127
 100128
 100129
 100130
 100131
 100132
 100133
 100134
 100135
 100136
 100137
 100138
 100139
 100140
 100141
 100142
 100143
 100144
 100145
 100146
 100147
 100148
 100149
 100150
 100151
 100152
 100153
 100154
 100155
 100156
 100157
 100158
 100159
 100160
 100161
 100162
 100163
 100164
 100165
 100166
 100167
 100168
 100169
 100170
 100171
 100172
 100173
 100174
 100175
 100176
 100177
 100178
 100179
 100180
 100181
 100182
 100183
 100184
 100185
 100186
 100187
 100188
 100189
 100190
 100191
 100192
 100193
 100194
 100195
 100196
 100197
 100198
 100199
 100200
 100201
 100202
 100203
 100204
 100205
 100206
 100207
 100208
 100209
 100210
 100211
 100212
 100213
 100214
 100215
 100216
 100217
 100218
 100219
 100220
 100221
 100222
 100223
 100224
 100225
 100226
 100227
 100228
 100229
 100230
 100231
 100232
 100233
 100234
 100235
 100236
 100237
 100238
 100239
 100240
 100241
 100242
 100243
 100244
 100245
 100246
 100247
 100248
 100249
 100250
 100251
 100252
 100253
 100254
 100255
 100256
 100257
 100258
 100259
 100260
 100261
 100262
 100263
 100264
 100265
 100266
 100267
 100268
 100269
 100270
 100271
 100272
 100273
 100274
 100275
 100276
 100277
 100278
 100279
 100280
 100281
 100282
 100283
 100284
 100285
 100286
 100287
 100288
 100289
 100290
 100291
 100292
 100293
 100294
 100295
 100296
 100297
 100298
 100299
 100300
 100301
 100302
 100303
 100304
 100305
 100306
 100307
 100308
 100309
 100310
 100311
 100312
 100313
 100314
 100315
 100316
 100317
 100318
 100319
 100320
 100321
 100322
 100323
 100324
 100325
 100326
 100327
 100328
 100329
 100330
 100331
 100332
 100333
 100334
 100335
 100336
 100337
 100338
 100339
 100340
 100341
 100342
 100343
 100344
 100345
 100346
 100347
 100348
 100349
 100350
 100351
 100352
 100353
 100354
 100355
 100356
 100357
 100358
 100359
 100360
 100361
 100362
 100363
 100364
 100365
 100366
 100367
 100368
 100369
 100370
 100371
 100372
 100373
 100374
 100375
 100376
 100377
 100378
 100379
 100380
 100381
 100382
 100383
 100384
 100385
 100386
 100387
 100388

1 Vines who had explained to Waymo’s counsel how downloading the entire SVN repository was
 2 normal operation. *See id.* Nor did Waymo disclose Tom Gorman who was heavily involved in
 3 the investigation. *See id.* Waymo also did not include Mr. Zbrozek, Mr. Vines, or Mr. Gorman as
 4 custodians for applying agreed-to search terms and did not collect or produce Mr. Gorman’s or
 5 Mr. Vines’ documents. *Id.* at ¶ 30. With the exception of two documents that were simply
 6 groupwide “blasts,” the only documents produced from Mr. Zbrozek were produced at 8:32 p.m.
 7 on the final day of discovery. Even then, Waymo withheld numerous documents on the grounds
 8 of privilege.

9 **F. Waymo Selectively Waives Privilege to Withhold Damaging Communications
 10 that Undermine its Conclusions and Violates The Court’s Orders.**

11 Waymo also used the attorney-client privilege as a sword and shield to disclose self-
 12 serving aspects of its forensic investigation, while hiding damaging communications, like those
 13 with Mr. Zbrozek and Mr. Gorman, from discovery. *See Dkt. 1272.* Defendants did not receive
 14 unredacted versions of many critical documents regarding Waymo’s investigation until September
 15 2, 2017 (*i.e.* Vu Decl. Exhibits 2-4), after the fact discovery and motion to compel cut-off, after
 16 key depositions had been taken, and after several rounds of motion practice. *Id.* at ¶ 40. After
 17 Judge Corley found Waymo had waived this privilege on August 18, 2017, Otto Trucking has had
 18 to request the Court’s assistance in forcing Waymo to comply with the Court’s order four
 19 additional times, the most recent on September 6, when Waymo improperly continued to shield
 20 communications that were part of its privilege waiver. Dkt. 1479.

21 After the Court’s August 18 waiver order, Waymo produced additional documents that
 22 were subject to the waiver on August 24 at 8:54 p.m., about three hours before the close of fact
 23 discovery. Vu Decl. at ¶ 32. Waymo continued to withhold information subject to the waiver
 24 through redactions, which forced Otto Trucking to address the issue at an August 28 hearing
 25 before Judge Corley. On August 30, Otto Trucking again appeared before Judge Corley to address
 26 Waymo’s privilege logs, which included documents that were subject to the waiver. Judge Corley
 27 ordered the parties to return the next day for an in camera review of the redacted documents. *Id.* at
 28 ¶ 36; Dkt. 1412. At that hearing on August 31, Judge Corley reviewed the redactions on the

1 documents that were produced post-waiver, as well as the privilege logs, and ordered additional
 2 documents produced. Vu Decl. at ¶ 37. On September 1, 2017, however, *the day after Judge*
 3 *Corley reviewed Waymo's privilege* logs, Waymo produced an extensive and additional privilege
 4 log referencing more than 1,300 documents, some of which related to the forensic investigation.
 5 *Id.* at ¶ 38. On September 8, 2017, Otto Trucking sought a meet and confer and potentially court
 6 intervention regarding Waymo's September 1 privilege log, but Waymo produced two additional
 7 documents that same day. *Id.* at ¶ 42.

8 In short, every time that Otto Trucking has asked the Court to intervene and order the
 9 production of more documents subject to the waiver order, the Court has ordered more documents
 10 produced. Each time Waymo has made another production, the documents have revealed more
 11 important information that has weakened its claims against Defendants. *Id.* at ¶ 43. Waymo has
 12 not voluntarily complied with the Court's orders, producing documents only when repeatedly
 13 compelled by the Court.

14 The disputes and Waymo's stone walling continue. On the last day of fact discovery,
 15 Waymo produced over 7200 documents, which accounts for nearly a third of their total
 16 production. Vu Decl. at ¶ 48. And since discovery closed, Waymo has produced over 1,600
 17 additional documents, some of which relate to Waymo's investigation and other discovery issues
 18 the parties have been discussing. Vu Decl. at ¶ 44.

19 Though the Court should not permit any of the evidence or inferences that Waymo
 20 proposes, if the Court does allow any evidence of claimed discovery misconduct by Defendants,
 21 Defendants should be allowed to respond in kind to present evidence of Waymo's discovery
 22 misconduct.

23 **III. CONCLUSION**

24 Waymo has failed to show that Otto Trucking has violated the Court's orders or that it is
 25 entitled to a jury instruction or an adverse inference. If anything, Waymo's discovery violations
 26 and continual hiding the ball with respect to its investigation of its central allegations in this case –
 27 the downloading of the 14,000 files from Google – counsel adverse inferences against Waymo.
 28

1 Dated: September 15, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

2 By: /s/ Neel Chatterjee
3 Neel Chatterjee
nchatterjee@goodwinlaw.com
4 Brett Schuman
bschuman@goodwinlaw.com
5 Shane Brun
sbrun@goodwinlaw.com
6 Rachel M. Walsh
rwalsh@goodwinlaw.com
7 Hong-An Vu
hvu@goodwinlaw.com
8 Hayes P. Hyde
hhyde@goodwinlaw.com
9 James Lin
jlin@goodwinlaw.com
10 **GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**

11 *Attorneys for Defendant: Otto Trucking LLC*

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing document including all of its attachments with the Clerk of the Court for the United States District Court for the Northern District of California by using the CM/ECF system on **September 15, 2017**. I further certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service of the publicly filed documents will be accomplished by the CM/ECF system.

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on
September 15, 2017.

/s/ Neel Chatterjee
NEEL CHATTERJEE